

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/723,574	11/26/2003	Ba-Zhong Shen	BP3134	9932		
51472	7590 06/26/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER		
	IARRISON & MARKI	CHASE, SI	CHASE, SHELLY A			
P.O. BOX 160 AUSTIN, TX			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
,			2133			
			DATE MAIL ED: 06/26/2004	DATE MAILED: 06/26/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Applic	ation No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/723	3,574	SHEN ET AL.				
		Exami	ner	Art Unit				
			A. Chase	2133				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	ication appears on	the cover sheet with	the correspondence	address			
A SH WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MINIOR OF THE MINIOR OF THE MONTHS FROM THE MINIOR OF THE MONTHS FROM THE MINIOR OF THE MONTHS FROM THE MONTHS FROM THE MONTHS AND	AILING DATE OF of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no nunication. atutory period will apply an will, by statute, cause the	THIS COMMUNICA be event, however, may a repl and will expire SIX (6) MONTH application to become ABAN	ATION. ly be timely filed  4S from the mailing date of this NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status			•		•			
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) file	d on 26 Novembe	. 2002					
3)□	<del>_</del>							
ت(۵	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
		so under Ex parte	Quayic, 1000 O.D.	11, 400 0.0. 210.				
Disposit	ion of Claims							
4)	Claim(s) is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)⊠	☑ Claim(s) <u>1-11 and 24-34</u> is/are allowed.							
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>12</u> is/are rejected.							
7)⊠	Claim(s) <u>13-23</u> is/are objected to.							
8)[	Claim(s) are subject to restrict	tion and/or election	n requirement.					
Applicat	on Papers				•.			
9)[	The specification is objected to by the	e Examiner.		•				
10)🖂	The drawing(s) filed on 26 November	r 2003 is/are: a)⊠	accepted or b) C	biected to by the Exa	aminer.			
-,_	Applicant may not request that any object			-				
•	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including							
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to		, .	•	, ,			
·	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119	•						
	•	far faraian neiseib.	da=251150 54	140(a) (d) a= (f)				
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim  ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	ior foreign priority	under 35 U.S.C. 9 1	19(a)-(d) or (1).				
a)	1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority	documente have h	oon received					
				aliantian No	•			
	' ' '		· ·		al Ctana			
	3. Copies of the certified copies	• •		ceived in this Nation	ai Stage			
* (	application from the Internatio	•	• • • •	المستامين	•			
S	See the attached detailed Office actio	ii ior a list.of the ce	erunea copies not re	:ceivea.	AHA			
				4	LEVA CHASE			
				2 100a	MARY EXAMINER			
Attachmen	t(s)			FIN	##*** ***			
1) 🛛 Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892)			nmary (PTO-413)				
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P		Paper No(s)/	Mail Date	TO 450)			
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or r No(s)/Mail Date	PTO/SB/08)	5)  Notice of Info 6)  Other:	ormal Patent Application (F	110-152)			
. чрс			-, <u> </u>					

Application/Control Number: 10/723,574

Art Unit: 2133

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1 to 34 are presented for examination.

### Information Disclosure Statement

2. The references listed in the information disclosure statement submitted on 9-30-2004, 1-5-2005 & 7-11-2005 have been considered by the examiner (see attached PTO-1449).

## **Double Patenting**

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claim 12 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type

Application/Control Number: 10/723,574 Page 3

Art Unit: 2133

double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/668,526. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 1 of USPA No. 10/668,526 contains every element of claim 12 of the instant application and as such anticipates claim 12 of the instant application.

"A later patent claim is not patentably distinct from an earlier patent claim if the later claim is obvious over, or **anticipated by**, the earlier claim. In re Longi, 759 F.2d at 896, 225 USPQ at 651 (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting because the claims at issue were obvious over claims in four prior art patents); In re Berg, 140 F.3d at 1437, 46 USPQ2d at 1233 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting where a patent application claim to a genus is anticipated by a patent claim to a species within that genus). " ELI LILLY AND COMPANY v BARR LABORATORIES, INC., United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, ON PETITION FOR REHEARING EN BANC (DECIDED: May 30, 2001).

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

## Allowable Subject Matter

- 5. Claims 13 to 23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 6. Claims 1 to 11 and 24 to 34 are allowed.

Application/Control Number: 10/723,574

Art Unit: 2133

7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art made of record teaches various decoders for decoding for low density parity check (LDPC) codes using symbol nodes, check nodes, updating the symbol nodes, check nodes and the LLR values. For instance, Yu-Hu (Efficient implementations of the sum-product algorithm for decoding LDPC codes, IEEE) discloses a system for updating the check nodes and the symbol nodes using the LLR values. Chen et al. (Reduced-complexity decoding of LDPC codes, IEEE) discloses decoding the LDPC codes using the bipartite graph and LLR values according to a belief-propagation (BP).

Page 4

However, the prior art made of record taken alone or in combination fails to teach or fairly suggest or render obvious the novel element of the instant invention.

Specifically, the prior art made of record, fails to teach or fairly suggest the limitation of "during a last iterative decoding iteration, making a best estimate for the symbol using that symbol's most recent corresponding plurality of possible soft symbol estimates; and making bit estimates based on the best estimate for the symbol such that the bit estimates are hard decisions for each of the individual bits of the symbol."

#### Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Application/Control Number: 10/723,574

Art Unit: 2133

Page 5

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shelly A. Chase whose telephone number is 571-272-3816. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur from 8:00 am to 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on 571-272-3819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SHELLY CHASE